

TERMS OF THE NEWS.

THE DAILY NEWS, by mail, one year \$6; six months \$3; three months \$1; one month 75 cents. Served in the city at FIFTEEN CENTS a week, payable to the carriers, or \$3 a year, paid in advance at the office.

THE TRI-WEEKLY NEWS, published on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, one year \$3; six months \$1.50; and 50 cents a month for any shorter period.

SUBSCRIPTIONS in all cases payable in advance, and no paper continued after the expiration of the time paid for.

ADVERTISEMENTS.—First insertion 15 cents a line; subsequent insertions 10 cents a line. Special Notices 20 cents a line each insertion. Business Notices 10 cents a line each insertion. All Advertisements must be paid for in advance.

NOTICES OF WANTS, To Rent, Lost and Found, Boarding, &c., not exceeding 20 words, 25 cents each insertion; over 20, not exceeding 30 words, 40 cents each insertion; over 30 and not exceeding 50 words, 50 cents each insertion. All Advertisements must be paid for in advance.

REMITTANCES should be made by Postoffice Money Order or by Express. If this cannot be done, protection against losses by mail may be secured by forwarding a draft on Charleston payable to the order of the proprietors of THE NEWS, or by sending the money by express to the order of RICHARD D. DAWSON & CO., Address No. 149 East Bay, Charleston, S. C.

The Charleston News.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1869.

THE CONTENTS OF OUR CHRISTMAS NUMBER.

The Christmas number of THE CHARLESTON NEWS will contain:

I. Mary Greeley, An Editor's Tale. By Anthony Trollope. The latest work of the popular English novelist, has never before been published in this country.

II. The Scene Painter's Wife. By Miss M. E. Braddon, the author of The Lady's Mile, Lady Audley's Secret, The Captain of the Venture, &c. A weird and romantic tale, which will be read with avidity and long remembered.

III. The Cannibal's Chant. A quaint and curious poem, original in manner and subject.

IV. A Narrow Escape. A lively and thrilling recital of an exciting adventure in the gay capital of France.

V. A Christmas Carol. A Poem.

VI. Family Government. Jesse B. Grant's part in the Administration—an over true tale of the times.

VII. The Modern Knight. A Poem.

VIII. Ejected by a Ghost. A startling and awe-inspiring story read on Christmas night.

IX. All about Alaska and its inhabitants. A tale of Nine Millions.

X. Sea Island Cotton Planting. A valuable article upon an important subject by the Hon. Jno. W. R. Pope.

XI. Foul Nominations. The identity of Junius settled at last.

Miscellaneous: Under London Bridge. The Roman Amphitheatre. The Philosophy of Dreams. The Life of a Female Singer. Housekeeping in Rome. The Dakota Wild Man, and a variety of other occasional articles and poems.

NEW FOR THE DAY.

—Gold closed at New York yesterday at 20½.
—The New York cotton market was quiet, steady at 20½; sales 100 bales.
—At Liverpool cotton was steady; upland 11½; Orleans 11½; sales 12,000 bales.
—Wilmington, N. C., paves her streets with sand.

—A State Female School Convention is to meet in San Francisco January 26.
—A game of chess lasting ten years has just been decided. One of the players lives in Germany, the other in New York.

—John Broughman is in Buffalo, Mrs. P. B. Bowler is in New Orleans, and John E. Owens is in St. Louis.

—One thousand dollars reward has been offered in New York by a father for the recovery of his child, seven years old, "stolen" by the father, who has been divorced from the mother.

—Governor Haight, of California, in his message just at hand, takes ground against Chinese immigration, but favors the admission of Chinese testimony in the courts.

—General Canby has ordered the payment on New Year's day, of one per cent, of the interest due on the Virginia State bonds, both coupon and registered, on the 1st of January last.

—In a street affray in New Orleans last Friday, Mr. P. J. Ducros, secretary of the Knickerbocker Insurance Company, shot and mortally wounded Mr. E. J. Byrd. The parties are connected by marriage, and the encounter grew out of family differences.

—The Richardson-McFarland case is to be revived in the Surrogate's Court, in New York, in a contest for his property. Mr. Richardson did not make a will, and his relatives intend to contest the validity of the death-bed will made under the ground that the dying declaration was under the influence of opiates at the time, and did not know what he was about.

—In consequence of the recent seizure of all the sugar in the bonded warehouses of New York and Brooklyn, for alleged frauds in weighing, that article has been seriously interfered with, and the price has advanced from two and a quarter to three and a half cents per pound, according to grade. A contemporary hopes that it will not run out by and by that the officers engaged in making the seizure were in a combination to get up a corner in sugar, and invoked the power of government to do what they lacked the nerve and capital to accomplish in the usual way. But stranger things have happened.

—The sharpest censures bestowed upon the "bigamous wedding" in New York are being religious press. The Catholic press, holding strict notions upon the sanctity of the marriage tie, have been pointedly condemnatory of the affair, but not much more so than the organs of the Episcopalian, the Methodist, the Baptist, Presbyterians and Congregationalists. The Churchman, (Episcopalian), in a review of the conduct of Messrs. Frothingham and Beecher, says positively: "It was a gratuitous piece of wrong-doing, and could be nothing but the ugliest form, and its sole meaning was to give an additional pang to the murderer, and to throw contempt upon the law of the State of New York and the holy ordinance of God, neither of which would sanction the marriage."

—Apropos of the "equal rights" business in Washington, "Mack" tells this story: "A negro member of Council recently offered and secured the passage of an ordinance denying license to any restaurant or place of amusement that refused to treat negro customers on a perfect equality with whites. The father of that measure is the owner of the principal barber shop in the city. While one of his workmen was scraping his chair the other day, I asked him if he ever had any colored customers? 'No, sah, we don't shave no niggers in this shop,' was the prompt reply. 'But,' said I, 'suppose a colored man were to come in and sit down in one of the chairs, like I, what would you do?' 'Pat him out, sah! Some shopkeepers shave niggers, but it is too 'spectable for dat.' 'You wouldn't refuse to shave the colored Congressmen from Louisiana, would you?' 'Yes, sah. Wouldn't shake no niggers in my shop, even if dey was President. One of General Grant's niggers came here one day—but he didn't git no shave—no, sah. Weso got all we can do to shave de white folks, and don't want no niggers.' 'The bushwhacker who attacked Mr. Turner, of Spartanburg, on the 8th, and wounded his daughter, have since set fire to his house and

government from the hands of pure and capable men; they made us subject to knaves and tricksters; they dishonored all that was honorable, made cheap all that was dear; they put our slaves on the judgment seat, and set them up in authority over educated white men and refined white women. They toiled and strove day and night and month after month, to set the heel of the negro on the neck of the white man; and now a Horace Greeley claims credit for his crew because our leaders were not sent to the gallows!

Mr. Greeley admits that the ignominious death of the Confederate leaders "would 'have rankled more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly combat on the field of battle,'" and he says besides:

"In short, if there be one lesson written all over the face of history, it seems to me that 'pride goeth before destruction'—that the conqueror in a civil feud who has glutted his vengeance stands off very near his final downfall."

The wrongs we have borne are greater than the wrongs of hemp and iron, and they rankle more. The conqueror has indulged his vengeance and indulges it still. We expect nothing less. But we can give back scorn for scorn with interest. This Union may hold the South while girt about with iron; but a "Union of hearts and Union of hands" there never will be, except against that very Radical revolutionary party of which Mr. Greeley desires to be the permanent head and front.

A Queer Proceeding.

The more we hear of the handsome Christmas gift which our immaculate legislators have voted themselves, in the shape of their per diem for the holidays—in advance—the more modest and consistent appears their action. It seems that the concurrent resolution for the advance payment originated in the House, and provided for an allowance of the per diem up to January 1. This was sent to the Senate, and so shocked the virtuous impulses of that august body that the resolution was instantly amended so as to allow the drawing of pay only up to December 23; and in this form the measure was sent back to the House. A committee of conference was asked, and the House speedily succeeded in convincing the Senate that it didn't know its own mind. So, instead of a compromise between December 23 and January 1, the committee reported back the resolution amended so as to give the pay, up to January 4—the form in which it was finally passed.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

Reconstruction—Vengeance.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

Reconstruction—Vengeance.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

Reconstruction—Vengeance.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

government from the hands of pure and capable men; they made us subject to knaves and tricksters; they dishonored all that was honorable, made cheap all that was dear; they put our slaves on the judgment seat, and set them up in authority over educated white men and refined white women. They toiled and strove day and night and month after month, to set the heel of the negro on the neck of the white man; and now a Horace Greeley claims credit for his crew because our leaders were not sent to the gallows!

Mr. Greeley admits that the ignominious death of the Confederate leaders "would 'have rankled more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly combat on the field of battle,'" and he says besides:

"In short, if there be one lesson written all over the face of history, it seems to me that 'pride goeth before destruction'—that the conqueror in a civil feud who has glutted his vengeance stands off very near his final downfall."

The wrongs we have borne are greater than the wrongs of hemp and iron, and they rankle more. The conqueror has indulged his vengeance and indulges it still. We expect nothing less. But we can give back scorn for scorn with interest. This Union may hold the South while girt about with iron; but a "Union of hearts and Union of hands" there never will be, except against that very Radical revolutionary party of which Mr. Greeley desires to be the permanent head and front.

A Queer Proceeding.

The more we hear of the handsome Christmas gift which our immaculate legislators have voted themselves, in the shape of their per diem for the holidays—in advance—the more modest and consistent appears their action. It seems that the concurrent resolution for the advance payment originated in the House, and provided for an allowance of the per diem up to January 1. This was sent to the Senate, and so shocked the virtuous impulses of that august body that the resolution was instantly amended so as to allow the drawing of pay only up to December 23; and in this form the measure was sent back to the House. A committee of conference was asked, and the House speedily succeeded in convincing the Senate that it didn't know its own mind. So, instead of a compromise between December 23 and January 1, the committee reported back the resolution amended so as to give the pay, up to January 4—the form in which it was finally passed.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

Reconstruction—Vengeance.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred thousand lives sacrificed in battle. To Mr. Greeley it may seem that all is gained when the right to exist is won. This feeling suits not this Southern clime. In South Carolina there is such a thing as personal dishonor, apart from physical suffering; and what is felt in the Carolinas is felt in Virginia and in every State of the South. The hemp which was "too dear" to be used would have been no shame, no disgrace. They who had faced the glittering steel and singing bullet, while Mr. Greeley wrote leaders in safety in Gotham, could meet and overcome the gallows. If they failed; if they could bear the steel and not the rope; if death for the South was a glory or a shame as it came on tented field or in prison yard; these men were not soldiers, nor Southern men—and Mr. Greeley is heartily welcome to them. The votes of men who betrayed their own people may be a gain to Radicalism, but are no loss to us.

And for what have we to thank even the Greeley faction of the Radical party? They did not hang our leaders, they did not trust us to our own property, they did not thrust every man who wore the gray into loathsome dungeons. This they dared not do! They clouted themselves with camping outside of the constitution, with ruling sovereign States as military satrapies, with manipulating the States to the greater profit and advantage of the grand Radical party. This was what they imposed upon us as a people. They went further. They tore the

Reconstruction—Vengeance.

Mr. Horace Greeley has written "a second letter to General Butler" through the columns of the New York Tribune, and mauls the hero of New Orleans and Bermuda Hundreds, because he is still unwilling to enfranchise any but the man "who has fully repented of the part he took in the rebellion."

General Butler, it must be said, did not mince matters in replying to the first letter of the philosopher of the Tribune. He said: "I think now that had an example been made of some half-dozen, more or less, of 'leading traitors of the South,' at this day 'all matters in the rebel States which now 'disturb public peace' would have been settled. Again, it is not the ex-rebel to whom I am opposed, but the present rebel, who is only restrained by the strong arm of the government from showing the intensity of his hate and the bitterness of his animosity toward the Union. And, with the aid of the sword, it is but justice to say that I have found but few such in the Confederate army, as I have been among the rebels who 'found safe and soft places at home' in the Confederacy, and especially the newspaper editors of the South, in whom I find such hatred of all that is loyal and patriotic—men who seem to feel themselves obliged to make up for their want of activity during the war by the exhibition of their malignity since the war—precisely as in the North some of the 'same class seem in like manner endeavoring to atone for the bitterness with which they required the war to be prosecuted by 'arguing universal amnesty,' since."

This home thrust brings us back to Mr. Greeley and his eloquent denunciation of vicarious punishments. He says:

"I shall differ from you then as I differ from you now. I believe the killing of many, or few, or one, of the Confederate chiefs at any time after the complete overthrow and collapse of their revolt would have been a fearful, ghastly blunder, sowing seeds of bitterness and wrath that must have borne evil fruit throughout future ages. I dislike vicarious punishments altogether; and I realize that in this case they would convey to the spared rebels this memento: 'You, too, deserve hanging; but then you are insignificant, and hence I spare you.' It would have been a patent of nobility for generations at the South to be able to claim kinship with a man who was tried, convicted and executed as one of the Confederate leaders. Their death would have opened a deep abyss between those who fought for and those who fought against the Union. One life taken would have ranked more and longer than a hundred thousand sacrificed in fair, manly collision on the field of battle."

This is all that we care to quote; for it is evident that Mr. Greeley does not dream that there are punishments more terrible than the cord or the bullet, which are still "fearful, ghastly blunders," which have rankled and do rankle more than a hundred